

NOT VOTING—5

Douglas Green Robertson
Frear Humphrey

So Mr. McCLELLAN's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BRIDGES, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to reconsider.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent because of illness.

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted: yeas 45, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Curtis	Morton
Allott	Dirksen	Mundt
Beall	Dodd	Prouty
Bennett	Dworshak	Russell
Bridges	Ervin	Saltonstall
Bush	Fulbright	Schoeppel
Butler	Goldwater	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Capehart	Holland	Smith
Carlson	Hruska	Stennis
Case, N.J.	Keating	Talmadge
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Thurmond
Chavez	Lausche	Wiley
Cooper	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Martin	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Anderson	Hennings	Mansfield
Bartlett	Hill	Monroney
Bible	Jackson	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Moss
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Muskie
Carroll	Johnston, S.C.	Neuberger
Church	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Clark	Kennedy	Pastore
Ellender	Kerr	Proxmire
Engle	Langer	Randolph
Gore	Long	Sparkman
Gruening	McCarthy	Symington
Hart	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Hartke	McNamara	Yarborough
Hayden	Magnuson	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—8

Douglas Green Murray
Eastland Humphrey Robertson
Frear Jordan

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 45, and the nays 45. There being a tie vote, the Chair votes "yea"; and the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 23, 1959, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 22, 1959:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be generals

Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Gen. Cortlandt Van Rensselaer Schuyler, O14905, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Carter Bowie Magruder, O15155, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) in the rank of general.

Lt. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) in the rank of general.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Extension of GI Law Benefits to Korean Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee was told recently that the educational training provided by the GI bills for World War II and the Korean conflict not only strengthened the productive power of our Nation, but enabled the veterans to earn more money, and, the witness added, "On the basis of additional income taxes which our Government collects on this added earning power, the cost of veterans education is paying better returns than any security listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Further,

those added income tax payments will continue and will probably increase over the years."

Support for my proposal to extend the benefits of the Korean GI bill is coming in from a wide variety of quarters. I am pleased to say a great many people agree with me that this measure would be an investment in the future of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a group of articles from Army Times for April 4, 1959.

The first article, written by Larry Carney, was published under the headline "Four Educators Back GI and Korea Bills."

The second article was published under the heading "Hill Told 4-Year College Course Is About Finished."

The heading on the third article reads "GI, Korea Bills Necessary, Educators Report to Hill."

The fourth article was headed "Outdo Non-Veterans Scholastically—Vets Do Well in College, Survey Shows."

The final article was headed "Senator SPARKMAN Backs GI Bill."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR EDUCATORS BACK GI AND KOREAN BILLS
(By Larry Carney)

WASHINGTON.—Four leading educators spoke out last week against any reduction in the benefit formula of the proposed new cold war GI bill to make it more acceptable to budget cutters in Congress. In testimony before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, headed by Senator RALPH D. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, the college administrators enthusiastically endorsed proposals to extend GI bill benefits to post-Korean ex-GI's.

Appearing before the subcommittee were Dr. Price Ashton, president of Ranger Junior College, Ranger, Tex.; Dr. Malcolm M. Willey, vice president, Minnesota University; Dr. Clarence B. Hilberry, president, Wayne State University; and Dr. Robert G. Bernreuter, dean of admissions, Pennsylvania State University.

At last week's hearings, Dr. Ashton told the subcommittee he felt the opinion of most

educators in his State was that the World War II and Korean GI bills should definitely be extended. Amounts now paid are too low, he said, and if the amounts are reduced it would make it practically impossible for veterans with families to go to college.

The educational allowances proposed in the Yarborough measure "do not grant the same degree of economic assistance to today's veteran as these same dollar amounts did for the Korean veterans," Dr. Hilberry told the subcommittee. "Living costs have increased since 1952."

Hilberry is chairman of the Michigan Council of State College Presidents. He said he had conferred with the presidents of eight other State-supported institutions which make up the council and was presenting their ideas as well.

He added that costs have increased to the veteran and as a result, the sum that a veteran will receive under the proposed cold war bill will support a smaller portion of his education than it did 7 years ago.

Dr. Bernreuter said he was afraid that if the monthly formula was reduced veteran students would "have to supplement their incomes" with outside employment.

He said this would show up in their academic achievements. "Instead of being better students than the nonveterans, the general effect would be to make them poorer students than the nonveterans."

Bernreuter said that Penn State's policy of giving preference to veterans is based upon the results of research studies contrasting the accomplishments of veterans with nonveterans. He said that "a study which we have just completed shows that veterans at Penn State make better scholastic records than nonveterans."

He added veterans were more inclined to finish their education and were involved in fewer disciplinary incidents on the campus.

YARBOROUGH, in his opening remarks, said the big question before the subcommittee was whether some or all of the readjustment benefits granted to veterans of War II and the Korea conflict should be made available to the thousands of young Americans, who, because of the compulsory draft law, are required to serve in the Armed Forces during the cold war.

The Texas lawmaker said there is an urgent need to restore to our young citizen soldiers at least a portion of the opportunities lost by military service, particularly in the cases of lost educational opportunities.

He also urged passage of his bill for post-Korea orphans, saying "It is only just and right that educational benefits be provided for children who find themselves fatherless because their parents were under legal compulsion to serve in our Armed Forces."

Other hearings will be conducted shortly after Congress' Easter recess. At that time the Senator plans to call to the rostrum other educators and officials of the Veterans' Administration, Defense Department, Budget Bureau, and the various veterans' organizations.

YARBOROUGH said he is hopeful that a readjustment bill for post-Korea veterans can be enacted by Congress at a very early date, so that eligible ex-GIs can resume their educational careers at the beginning of the next school semester.

The principal feature of YARBOROUGH's proposal to extend the GI bill is the provision which will continue the educational portions of the Korea measure. The cutoff date for the Korea bill was January 31, 1955. The Yarborough measure would extend the rights through July 1, 1963.

The bill provides 1½ days of schooling for each day of active service for veterans who served honorably 90 days or more.

The bill also provides vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans, and extends eligibility for home and farm loan guarantees.

In addition, the proposed measure would authorize mustering out pay of \$100 per person for domestic or foreign service for veterans honorably discharged after the date of its enactment.

Under the peacetime war orphans' measure, each surviving child would be entitled to educational assistance up to 36 months, or to the equivalent in on-the-job training.

HILL TOLD 4-YEAR COLLEGE COURSE IS ABOUT FINISHED

WASHINGTON.—A Senate veterans affairs subcommittee was told last week that the days of the 4-year college curriculum is about over. Four of the country's leading educators blamed this situation on the rapid missile-age expansions in the various technical and scientific fields.

Dr. Clarence B. Hilberry, president of Wayne State University, told the subcommittee, "it has been a long time since anyone finished engineering school in 4 years." He said that as a matter of fact, it hasn't happened for a long time even though we still call our courses full-year courses.

The Detroit educator said that many 4-year courses are becoming 5-year programs. The latest to join the list is pharmacy. These programs are not changing at just one school but at all the schools across the country, Hilberry said.

Many ex-GIs in school now under the Korea bill are not going to finish their curricula in the 4 years they are given school assistance by Uncle Sam.

"A great many of them are going to have to find the resources somewhere to continue for a 5th, 6th, and 7th year," Hilberry said, "before they have the masters' degrees and the doctorates which are required in their respective fields."

Dr. Malcolm W. Willey, academic vice president at the University of Minnesota, brought out statistics to prove that few students receive the baccalaureate degree in 4 years.

His figures show that nearly 70 percent of the students at Minnesota require more time than the traditional 4 years to obtain their first degree.

Willey said the figure was 71 percent in the school's College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics; 77 percent in technology; 61 percent in business, and 73 percent in education. He said that in Minnesota's College of Science, Literature, and the Arts, the number was 58 percent.

Willey said these figures indicate that one cannot assume that because a student enters college at 18 he will have completed his degree requirements by 22—the age at which he is likely to be called up under selective service.

He said this point "bulwarks the interruption-of-education argument, which is a valid one."

GI, KOREA BILLS NECESSARY EDUCATORS REPORT TO HILL

Four of the Nation's leading educators told a Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee last week that an extension of the GI bill to cold war ex-GIs was vital to our national security.

They said the War II and Korea bills have more than proved their investment through higher national income and better trained scholars and technicians.

A condensed version of the testimony follows:

"STATEMENT OF ROBERT G. BERNREUTER, DEAN OF ADMISSIONS AND SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS, THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA.

As the admissions officer for the Pennsylvania State University, it is my responsibility to enroll a total of 6,700 new undergraduate students for the fall semester of 1959. In doing so, I will give preference to those students who have served on active duty in the

Armed Forces. This policy of giving preference to a veteran is not based, to any significant degree, upon sentimentality. Even though I am myself a veteran of War II and have personal sympathy with the problems confronting the young veteran, I do not give preference to veterans for sentimental reasons. Nor am I giving preference to them because of the nostalgic memories of those professors who remember with pleasure the days immediately following War II when a large proportion of all their students were veterans who enlivened their classes with their alert minds and their pointed questions. They enjoyed teaching such classes.

"The policy of giving preference to veterans is based upon the results of research studies contrasting the accomplishments of veterans with nonveterans.

"A study which we have just completed shows that veterans make better scholastic records than do nonveterans. Last semester at Penn State, the average grade earned by the male nonveteran student was a C. The average grade made by a male veteran student was a C+. The proportion of nonveterans who were dismissed for poor scholarship was twice as large as the proportion of veterans.

Another indication of the extent to which the veterans make better use of their opportunities is shown in the percentage of students who quit before graduating. Among those who were admitted last year as freshmen, more than one-third of the nonveterans quit. Among the veterans, less than one-fourth did not return. Proportionally approximately 1½ times as many nonveterans quit as was true of the veterans.

"Still another reason for preferring veterans has been found through a study of the disciplinary actions the university has had to take involving undergraduate students. Out of 1,587 veterans, only 4 were involved in disciplinary actions. This is approximately 1 out of each 400 veterans. This is a clear demonstration of the reason why the dean of men at our university, who is responsible for the discipline of men students, prefers to have us enroll veterans.

"The dean of men has also provided evidence which shows that veterans more frequently possess the desirable attributes which we seek to develop in our students.

"Each year the male students who reside in our residence halls are evaluated with regard to their personal adjustments, their maturity, the leadership qualities that they show, the seriousness of their attitudes toward their studies, and their ability to get along with other students.

"The veterans consistently receive higher ratings in these desirable attributes than do the students who have not had military experience.

"Each year the dean of men chooses a group of male students to act as residence hall counselors. In choosing such counselors from among those students who apply in large numbers each year he chooses those who show the greatest degree of maturity and seriousness of purpose and the ability to assume responsibility. He has not consciously given preference to men with military experience.

"Nevertheless, when he made a tally, at my request, he found that of the 36 students now employed as counselors 32 of them are veterans.

"Only four nonveterans were able to meet the standards set by his office for the position of residence hall counselor.

"It is now clear that veterans have shown themselves to be better students than nonveterans through their more serious application to their studies, through their earning of higher grades, through their smaller drop-out rates, through their better discipline, through their better citizenship, and through their increased ability to assume responsibility.

"STATEMENT OF CLARENCE B. HILBERRY, PRESIDENT OF WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY AND CHAIRMAN OF THE MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF STATE COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

"I would like to make several comments about the value of the bills now before you. First, the educational benefits are particularly valuable, since they permit a wide range of choice by the individual veteran among the various educational opportunities that are most likely to be of value to him.

"These opportunities range from advanced professional and scholarly study to on-the-job training in applied skills.

"Secondly—and I want to stress this point—the proposed legislation, in the judgment of nearly all of us in higher education wisely provides for the payment of benefits directly to the individual veteran.

"The veteran then attends the school or college of his choice. Since our experience across the country appears to be so uniformly favorable, I want to endorse strongly the provisions of the legislation for direct payment to the veteran.

"A third point. The educational allowances proposed in these bills do not grant the same degree of economic assistance to today's veterans as these same dollar amounts did for the Korean veteran.

"Living costs have increased since 1952 and therefore dormitory charges, rental for housing, and expenses for board, tuition, supplies and equipment have also increased in cost to the student. As a result, the sum that a veteran will receive under this bill will support a smaller portion of his educational costs than it did 7 years ago. These increases in costs are clear in our own recent experience at Wayne State University.

"A number of justifiable requests for loans have been made by students attending the university under Public Law 550. Such requests were apparently unnecessary only a few years ago.

"In conclusion, I would like to say that in our experience in public higher education in Michigan we have found that the educational benefits provided veterans have made possible educational opportunities for a large number of very able young men who otherwise would not have been able to attend a college or university.

"The bills before you will constitute, I believe, a positive contribution to the total education needs of our Nation. They incorporate the essential principle of direct payment to veterans. The level of allowance though not equal to preceding allowances is substantial. Additional needs of men in this group might perhaps better be met by increasing the loan funds available under the National Defense Education Act.

"STATEMENT OF DR. MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

"My experience convinces me that the earlier GI bills did contribute fundamentally to national welfare, for there is no doubt that they made it possible for, and encouraged, larger numbers of men to obtain college training.

"The students thus stimulated to seek training and enabled to complete it, our University of Minnesota figures show, have fallen heavily in agriculture, in education, in business, and in technology—as well as in the specialties of the liberal arts college.

"No one can question the importance of doing everything we can to further the training of specialized personnel. For several years I served as a member of General Hershey's Selective Service Advisory Committee on Specialized Personnel, which was basically concerned with the need for more manpower.

"I also served as a member of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training which made one of the most comprehensive studies yet undertaken on our

country's human resources and their utilization.

"The so-called GI bills have made an immeasurable contribution in meeting the needs these two reports so sharply outlined.

"One cannot say that all of these students would have failed to go on to college training had there been no veterans legislation. But we can testify that a large percentage of these students are drawn from the economically less advantaged families of Minnesota, and we can assume that an appreciable number of them would not have had the resources to enter upon or complete a college education.

"We do know that a higher percentage of these students have gone further with their education and have finished it, than otherwise would be true.

"I might add, too, that the cost of going to college is rising like everything else. At Minnesota we are confronting further tuition raises. Each such increase makes it more difficult, to the point of impossibility, for some young men and women to enter or stay in college.

"The figures I quoted earlier on loan experience indicate that this is so. For one group at least, the GI assistance has served to offset in some measure these problems the students face with rising costs.

"We also know that any break in the educational career of a student, whether for health, financial, or military reasons, reduces definitely the chances that the student will complete his college work. For this reason the break associated with military service can well be the factor that results in failure to complete an education.

"It is my experience, based on contact with students, that the GI privileges have been a compensating factor that has induced students to return to college, following interruption.

"With respect to this matter of interruption, it is sometimes argued that students who graduate from high school at 18 can essentially complete their college education before military service since selective service calls do not come on the average until age 22.

"This might be true if all students did, in fact, enter college at 18 and continued without interruption to the baccalaureate degree. Our experience at Minnesota, where we have studied this question, shows that students in large numbers do not receive the baccalaureate degree in a nominal 4 years.

"Indeed, specific data reveal that in our college of agriculture, forestry, and home economics more than 71 percent of the students take more than the customary 4 years to the baccalaureate degree; in technology more than 77 percent; in business more than 61 percent; and in education 73 percent. In our college of science, literature, and the arts the figure is over 58 percent; and for the university as a whole, 69 percent of the recipients of the first degree take more than the normal, traditional time in school. Another observation can be made bearing on the age-range of our undergraduate students.

"The average age of a Minnesota freshman at matriculation is approximately 18 and only 33 percent of the freshmen complete requirements for a degree within 4 years after starting, or by the age of 22. Many reasons account for this, including the introduction of 5-year curricula which are increasing, as well as general enrichment of the individual's curriculum.

"I cite these figures to indicate that one cannot assume that because a student enters college at 18 he will have completed his requirements by 22, the age at which he is likely to be called up under selective service. This point bulwarks the interruption of education argument, which is a valid one.

"STATEMENT OF DR. PRICE ASHTON, PRESIDENT OF RANGER JUNIOR COLLEGE, RANGER, TEX.

"I would like to speak and say at this time that the educational institutions in our

State are highly in favor of the extension of benefits to veterans of the cold-war category.

"My experience with veterans under Public Laws 346 and 550 has been very gratifying.

"In the Association of Texas Colleges and the Southern Association many surveys have been made, and we have found that the veterans of War II and Korea have all tended to increase the level of education rather than to diminish it.

"At the same time we have encountered many problems with veterans simply because they are more mature.

"For that reason, we feel that we should provide benefits to the peacetime veteran because his problems are as great as a veteran of the Korean war in finishing his education. Oftentimes they have families, even dependents, and the requirements are as great or greater than they have been in the last 6 or 7 years. Expenses are higher.

"The colleges and universities in our State can take care of the veterans and do it adequately.

"We would like to see sufficient money provided by this Congress to make it a positive solution to the problem of the veteran to attend university or college.

"We have had various programs at our college in particular to try to take care of some of the financial difficulties that arise from a veteran coming out and not having adequate money to attend the college or university of his choice.

"I think generally the families of these veterans are particularly interested in having something to offer the veteran when he comes out of the service.

"Even though he serves stateside, or on foreign duty they realize that he (veteran) has a period of readjustment that will be difficult for him when he comes out into civilian life. For that reason they are particularly concerned with this legislation, and many of them express themselves along those lines.

"They feel as if it is one of the greatest pieces of legislation that has been offered in many years.

"I know in California—and I talked to many educators out there—that they have had like experiences on the quality and standard of grades and the improvement of the general attitude, disciplinary conditions of our colleges and universities through these veterans.

"I would like here to congratulate the veterans of the Korea and World War II conflicts, those who have participated in the program, because they have been a group to congratulate, and it has been very gratifying."

OUTDO NONVETERANS SCHOLASTICALLY—VETS DO WELL IN COLLEGE, SURVEY SHOWS

WASHINGTON.—Ex-GI's fare better scholastically in college than nonveterans, a recently completed survey at Pennsylvania State University revealed. Dr. Robert G. Bernreuter, dean of admission for Penn State, told a Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee last week that nonveterans averaged "C" last semester at State while the average for male veterans was "C-plus." He was one of four educators that testified in favor of extending GI bill benefits to cold war ex-GI's.

He said the proportion of nonveterans "who were dismissed for poor scholarship was twice as large as the proportion of veterans."

Bernreuter said the study also revealed that less veterans quit before graduating than nonveterans. He said that more than one-third of the nonveterans who enrolled as freshmen last year did not return this semester. Among the veterans, less than one-fourth did not return.

Another part of the survey shows that ex-GI's get into less trouble than nonveterans. Out of 1,587 veterans at Penn State last semester only 4 were involved in disciplinary actions. This is approximately 1 out

of each 400 veterans. The nonveteran ratio is 1 out of 84.

The Penn State educator said this comparison "is a clear demonstration of the reason why the dean of men at our university, who is responsible for the discipline of men students, prefers to have us enroll students."

He said that the dean of men "has also provided evidence which shows that veterans more frequently possess the desirable attributes which we seek to develop in our students."

Each year the University chooses a group of male students to act as residence hall counselors. It chooses those who show the greatest degree of maturity and seriousness of purpose, and the ability to assume responsibility, Bernreuter said.

He pointed out that the dean while "not consciously" giving preference to men with military service found that of the 36 students now employed as counselors, 32 of them are veterans.

"It is now clear," Bernreuter added, "that veterans have shown themselves to be better students than nonveterans through their more serious application to their studies, through their earning of higher grades, through their smaller dropout rates, through their better discipline, through their better citizenship and through their increased ability to assume responsibility."

Penn State's preference for veteran students is based upon the results of research studies, not sentiment. Bernreuter said many professors have "nostalgic memories" of the days immediately following War II when a large proportion of all their students were veterans who enlivened their classes with their alert minds and their pointed questions.

The professors enjoyed teaching such classes and the Penn State survey bears that out.

SENATOR SPARKMAN BACKS GI BILL

The following message is typical of the interest legislators are showing in the cold war GI bill. It was broadcast over 12 Alabama radio stations by Senator JOHN S. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, last weekend:

"This is your Senator, JOHN SPARKMAN. Today I want to talk with you about legislation of interest to Alabama's 348,000 veterans of World War II and the Korean war, as well as those veterans who have served since those wars.

"Of special interest to these veterans who have served since that time is the fact that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is beginning hearings on legislation that I am sponsoring which would extend the benefits of the GI bill to these veterans. More than 20,000 Alabama veterans would benefit immediately under my bill, with the total reaching 90,000 by 1965.

"I am sponsoring this bill because it would be an incentive for young men to volunteer for service in the Armed Forces and because it is only fair to provide veterans serving now some of the benefits for their service to their country and for the loss of time from civilian pursuits.

"I have no hesitancy about supporting an extension of this bill—and that's what it is. The program is in effect now for all veterans who entered service after January 31, 1955. What it has done for the War II and Korea soldiers it can well do for our soldiers who have entered service since that date.

"This GI bill is in no sense a gift to its recipients. It is a well-earned reward for a well-done job. I feel that the program should continue as long as we continue to draft the youth of our Nation away from their normal civilian pursuits.

"A total of 7.8 million War II veterans took on-the-job training. Education under the GI bill went to many men and women who otherwise could not have afforded it. This education produced 440,000 engineers; 238,000 teachers; 168,000 doctors and dentists;

112,000 scientists; 105,000 lawyers, and 93,000 social scientists and economists.

"Think what a stockpile of needed professional and technical people this program has afforded for these times when we need them so badly. Nearly 230,000 Alabamians were educated and trained following War II and the Korean war.

"The Veterans' Administration expects that by 1970 veterans will have paid back, through the medium of extra income taxes, the cost of the education that was borne by the Government.

"Another bill that I am sponsoring would give veterans of War II and the Korean war who have lost their national service life insurance a chance to reinstate it.

"Veterans would be given a 1-year period in which to file. The cost of this program to the taxpayer would be nothing. All administrative costs would be borne by the policyholder. This bill is pending before the Senate Finance Committee. A similar measure passed the Senate last year as an amendment to another bill, but was omitted by the Senate-House conference committee.

"When War II and Korea war veterans were separated from service they had the option either to keep or to cancel their national service life insurance. Many chose to cancel because of financial difficulties, or simply because it was easy to do so. I remember my own experience from War I. The pay for the premium on my insurance was simply taken out of my check each month. Well, when I was discharged, naturally I just didn't continue to pay. I had the opportunity to renew it under an act passed by Congress some years after that. I renewed it and I'm carrying it today. I believe the veteran of our War II and Korean war ought to be given the same opportunity.

"I wish I could talk to you about other legislation I am sponsoring but I must sign off."

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by

Hon. Frank E. Moss, of Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 22, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on March 31 our able and distinguished colleague from Utah [Mr. Moss] addressed the Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet at Conrad, Mont.

I ask unanimous consent that his address on that occasion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, UTAH, BEFORE THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY BANQUET AT CONRAD, MONT.

Certainly it is a real distinction to be invited to address a group of dedicated Democrats on the day they honor such party stalwarts as Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. And I am fully aware that in Conrad, Mont., I am among very good Democrats indeed—members of the party who are effective as well as loyal—who give foot service as well as lip service. Ponderle County (Ponderay) is famous for the size of its Democratic turnouts at party functions, like Jefferson-Jackson dinners, and at the polls.

I am happy to see and greet you all and to visit again with those you have chosen to lead you in party affairs. In mentioning

some, I realize that many more remain unmentioned; and that, in this type of activity, it is the work of every individual and the carrying of every district that makes it possible to keep the party going and gives people like me the opportunity of serving my State in Washington.

You all realize, I am sure, the pleasure it gives me to see again, even for a short time, the grandeur of the mountains and plains, the lakes and waterfalls, of the West. And to visit in Montana, a state that is linked to my own bonds of friendship and mutual interest, and also with a common pioneering tradition, and by many of your people being descendants of early Utah Mormon pioneer families.

I appreciate the confidence of Congressman ANDERSON in inviting a freshman Senator to address the big celebration in his home town. And I learned coming in tonight that the Congressman is one of those somewhat unusual men who can carry his home town in an election. I am told that ROY ANDERSON has always been a leader, and I believe it, because I can tell you that he has certainly shown that leadership in Washington in every way—from being an officer in the Thursday Morning Prayer Breakfast Group to outstanding work for the Hawaii statehood bill in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As a major general in the Army Reserve, Congressman ANDERSON is the highest ranking Reserve officer in the Congress. As every one in my audience knows, he commands the 96th Infantry Division, of which there are many units in Utah; and we have many mutual friends in that organization. Fortunately, he has been assigned to the Armed Services Committee, where his experience can be used to best advantage in helping to guide our defense program during these critical times. On the Interior Committee, Congressman ANDERSON has rendered yeoman service in Indian matters. Our Indian brethren appreciate his sympathetic and constructive interest in their problems.

For a new Senator, Washington has many surprises, most of them pleasant. My biggest surprise, however—and I think I can claim an exclusive on this one—was to be asked to address Lincoln Day as well as Jefferson-Jackson dinners. One of the first pieces of mail I opened was from Republican National Chairman Mead Alcorn, requesting my preferences as to places to deliver Lincoln Day speeches.

And actually, I should like the opportunity of talking to a Republican Lincoln Day audience. They might not like what they heard, but I could tell them some things they don't hear often enough and that they ought to know. For one thing, I could quote them words of Lincoln that the Republicans don't use very often. For example, Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present * * * as our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew." How many Republican Lincoln Day speakers quoted that this year? Or were they talking about the balanced budget and that alone? Our revered Civil War President also said: "There are already among us those who, if the Union be preserved, will live to see it contain 250 millions of population. The struggle of today is not altogether for today; it is for a vast future also." Lincoln thought and planned not only for the present but for the great future which he saw for America.

And it is no accident that those we honor today predate Lincoln by many years; and no accident that our party is so much older than the Republican Party. For, if there is any organization or institution, it is just this ability to think anew and act anew when conditions require it.

I object to conservatives wrapping themselves in the mantle of Jefferson as much as I do the mantle of Lincoln. The conservatives of Jefferson's day were not those

who signed the Declaration of Independence or helped construct and obtain ratification of the Constitution.

Let the standpatters read this, inscribed on a panel of the Memorial Room of the Jefferson Memorial. I quote: "I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions. But laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change; with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times."

What conservative standpat Republican of that day or this day would have had the courage and vision to obtain the Louisiana Purchase and secure to America in her infancy the great State of Montana and all of her sister States down river to the gulf?

Jefferson was a man of action and courage; but, above all, a man of vision. Because of these, I am happy to count myself a Jeffersonian Democrat and to point to the distinguished Senators from Montana as worthy successors to the Jeffersonian tradition.

As the experienced and respected chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, JAMES E. MURRAY, stands today as the most powerful individual in America influencing the development of water resources. I am most grateful for the opportunity of serving with him on the committee. I also wish to acknowledge his personal friendship and encouragement. Before the session, when I visited Washington to make plans for the beginning, it was Senator MURRAY who made my task much easier by making available the use of his office and facilities.

And we are all aware of the outstanding contribution to the leadership of the U.S. Senate made by MIKE MANSFIELD, and of the meaning to the West of that leadership. Senator MANSFIELD is the Democratic Party whip, or assistant leader. He is a leader on the Foreign Affairs Committee. I point out further that the policy of MANSFIELD, that all Senators must have membership on important committees, has greatly benefited our section; and, at the same time increased the contribution that new Members can make to the work of the Senate. So successful has been this policy in fact, that public approval, plus the nudge given by the electorate last fall, has forced the Republican leadership to adopt a similar one.

And wouldn't the growing political power of the West have delighted Andrew Jackson. Old Hickory was the first western President, coming from what was to easterners the frontier—Tennessee. And however different the backgrounds of Jefferson, the Virginia intellectual, and Jackson, the Tennessee warrior, may have been, their basic political philosophy was in agreement on one most important point—that the Government of this Republic belonged to all the people.

The Western Conference of Democratic Senators now includes the States of Alaska, Oklahoma, and Texas, and shortly Hawaii. We include 23 of the 28 Senators from the West; and when Hawaii's 2 Democratic Senators are elected, we shall be 25 of 30 Senators. Not only do we have numbers, but we have leadership as well.

Speaking of the election, one of the most interesting features to me is the reaction of the Republicans to their defeat.

To go back just a few years, about the time General Eisenhower emerged as the man who might restore the Republican presidential dynasty, professional advertising and public relations men were brought into political campaigns as never before. Often to their surprise, these gentlemen were presented as able to put vote getting on a scientific basis.

If they could sell soap or automobiles, it was said, why not candidates? And why not? What was forgotten is that the same brand of soap or the same make of car is

not always the most popular; or, to put it another way, advertising men, like the rest of us, have their failures as well as their successes.

But the Eisenhower campaigns were certainly successful, and the Republican leadership had their big contributors, the rank and file, and themselves, sold on the fact that this was the answer.

So their reaction to the defeat of 1958 is that something went wrong with the sales talk. What they need, the newspapers report, is a new image. Not new candidates. Not a new program. Above all, not new ideas. Just a new image—a new front to present to the voters.

While the Republicans are searching for their new image—something that will make Senator GOLDWATER and Governor Rockefeller look good together—we Democrats have more serious business to attend to. It is up to us to supply the deficiencies in Republican thinking, in Republican programs, and, as far as Congress can, in Republican leadership. We promised the voters action. Let's see how we are producing on that promise.

The Easter recess is the close of the first phase of a session of Congress. Newspaper commentators in Washington are saying that no Congress has done more in this short time than has this one.

Normally, at this stage, no major bills have been acted on; legislation is in the drafting stage or in committee. But we went to the country last fall with a program, and we are enacting it. Here are some of the things the Senate has done:

We have passed a housing bill to bring closer our goal of a decent home for every American.

We have passed airport legislation to prepare America for the jet age in transportation.

We have started a nationwide program to put depressed areas back on their feet.

We have added another great Western State—Hawaii—to the Union.

We have moved ahead in clearing the Nation's slum areas and helping urban renewal.

And, as always, we have stood with the administration on vital matters of foreign policy, even while disagreeing with the White House on many points of national defense.

Much remains to be done, and we are working on many other problems.

The Montana delegation is leading the fight to develop a farm program that will insure the prosperous continuance of the family size farm and provide the farmer with a fair share of the national income. And one which, if properly administered, will eventually cost the taxpayer less money. I am disturbed at the growing resentment of consumer groups at the cost and ineffectiveness of our present program. This cost is being used to separate the farmer and the farm program from necessary labor support.

Another vital program is that of education. The administration continues to do everything possible to put this on an "every locality for itself" basis, even advocating eliminating Federal contributions to areas having unusual educational demands due to Federal projects.

I am happy to be supporting Senator MURRAY and your distinguished First District Congressman, LEE METCALF, as a cosponsor of their bill to provide some degree of equalization of education on a national basis. While the control and administration of education may be a local function, the quality of education, in times like these, is very much a matter of national concern. We cannot maintain our military position or our economic position without an adequate program. And equalization of opportunity is a vital part of such a program.

Both Utah and Montana have State equalization programs. We have long recognized the folly of allowing educational opportunity to depend on the amount of taxable property that happens to fall in a particular

school district. Both Utah and Montana educate large numbers of children who leave the States as soon as they are through with school and ready to become taxpayers. And our equalization programs have not meant centralized State control. What we have done in our States we can—and should—do in the Nation.

But of major importance to the West, I think, and of vital importance to the Nation, is the matter of the preservation and development of our natural resources, and of our most important resource—water.

Certainly it is not necessary for me to convince a Montana audience that we need to conserve our water and other resources. But we still have a big job to do in this field—let's make no mistake about that. And we westerners must continue to take the lead in showing why it is in the interest of all America to develop these resources. And as Democrats we must make the Nation see that we are going to get full development only with a Democrat in the White House.

It is true that we are beginning to recognize that water conservation is a national, not a local, problem. As our water table falls, our demand increases. Today we are using about 240 billion gallons a day. By 1975, if our 175 million population grows to 225 million as expected, even our present rate of consumption would strain our resources. But our rising standard of living requires much more water per capita both for personal and home use and for industrial expansion. It is expected that by 1975 we will need 350 billion gallons a day, or more than a 90 percent increase over the amount used in 1950.

Preservation of water resources is one of the principal items claiming the attention of the Congress, and the Western Conference of Democratic Senators is actively working on a commission to survey the Nation's needs. Already, we look upon resource development as an investment—not as an expense. We must make all our people see the problem in these terms.

One change that might help and an idea that is getting some attention in Washington these days, is a more businesslike accounting system for the Government. The plan is to separate, as businesses do, items that represent capital investments and self-liquidating projects from expenditures for regular expense items. It might be that defense items could be placed in still a third category. This would make discussion of budget items more specific and enable us to comprehend this complicated subject more clearly. It is hoped that it would promote greater public understanding and interest in the Government's fiscal affairs.

One of the problems of Utah and the Upper Colorado River Basin States is to assure adequate appropriations to push ahead on the great Upper Colorado River project. A whole speech could easily be devoted to the history, the features, and the benefits of the upper Colorado storage project that is now under way. It is an example of the work that is necessary and the time that often must be expended to get these projects going.

For more than 50 years this project has been in mind. Some land withdrawals were made as early as 1904.

The project, when completed, will develop an area of 100,000 square miles. It will consist of four large mainstream dams, one on the Green River on the Utah-Wyoming border, one on the Colorado on the Arizona-Utah border, one on the San Juan in New Mexico, and one on the Gunnison River in Colorado.

It provides a true basinwide approach to the development of the water and power resources. A basin fund is created as a master account in the U.S. Treasury. This account will receive all funds appropriated by Congress for the project and all revenue collected from irrigation, power, and municipal water sales, or other sources.

After payment of interest, operation, and maintenance costs, the revenues will be allocated on a percentage basis to the four States and will be used for participating projects in the State.

The project will add 1 million kilowatts to upper basin power capacity; 132,360 acres of new land will come under irrigation, and 234,000 acres will receive supplemental water.

One of the most interesting aspects of one of the projects, not yet started, is that it will provide a means of raising the standard of living of America's largest Indian tribe—the Navahos. The Navajo Dam, in Arizona, will provide water largely for the use of these people, who need rehabilitation so much.

More than 200 different minerals are found in the Colorado Basin area, and the project will provide the water and power necessary for their full and economic development.

The great Glen Canyon and Flaming Gorge Dams now under construction will allow the upper basin States to store sufficient water so that the commitment to the lower basin States will be in storage and will allow much water now going down the Colorado into the Gulf of Mexico to be diverted to irrigation.

This is a self-sufficient project. Every cent the Treasury pays out will be returned with interest. It is an investment in America's future.

Great recreation areas will be opened up, not only for scenic boating, fishing, etc., but the area will develop greatly in such items as bird refuges, for ducks and other migratory birds.

Our problems are your problems—because all America is one, indissoluble—in building upper Colorado and thus building our country; just as your problems are our problems—in building your great Missouri Basin and northwest projects.

The Yellowstone Dam on the Bighorn River, Missouri River Basin project was authorized

in 1944; the right-of-way problem on Indian lands was settled in the last session of Congress. But the project cannot be begun until it is put in the budget. But the administration has not submitted a budget request because of its "no new starts" policy. That great dam would have storage capacity of 1,080,000 acre feet, powerplant capacity of 200,000 kilowatts, and annual generation of 597 million kilowatts per hour. Both Montana and Wyoming would benefit and grow, and so would America. This would be an investment in the future of America.

What I have said about Yellowstone applies to Clark Canyon Dam, the east branch unit of the Missouri Basin project, and the Beaverhead River in the southwestern part of your great State. There is no money in the President's budget for these needed projects, and the administration's policy of "no new starts" would doom them. However, you can count on your Democratic Congressmen and Senators to fight for these western development projects.

But theirs is a greater reason than recreation or economic benefit and comforts to our people for the development of our natural resources. That reason is national survival.

During a hundred and fifty years of our history, our isolated position behind the oceans made us invulnerable to powerful surprise attack. And our great productive machine made it possible for us to get ready, with ample time, after an attack. Today we are minutes away from Moscow via missiles. In our life time this profound change has occurred, the details of which we are all too painfully familiar. We are aware that the Soviet Union increased its territory and expanded its world influence since World War II, but even more ominous for the future is the fact that the backward nations are beginning to use the productive methods developed by the West; and, as they do, their enormously greater populations are beginning to tell against us. We must be ready in armament, and we must grow industrially and economically.

The men in the Kremlin know what kind of world they want it to be 20 years from now. They boldly plan for that world and channel their resources, their educational facilities, and their diplomatic maneuvers to making it that kind of world.

If we are to win in this kind of struggle, we must decide what kind of world we want it to be 20 years from now. And within the framework of democratic individual liberty, make the necessary effort to create that kind of world.

In Washington today we hear the refrain: "How much does it cost?" "Can we afford to keep ahead?" Let us remind ourselves that those, like Jefferson, who signed the Declaration of Independence, did not count the cost. They had lived under tyranny. They wanted freedom.

Now maybe I have analyzed our situation all wrong, but I don't think so. But if I am right in thinking that we must have farsightedness, courage, decisiveness, leadership in the period ahead, I believe that is calling for a Democrat in the White House. Our party has provided vision and decision in times of crisis before. With the challenge that lies ahead, I am proud that our party can put forward so many men of capacity, experience, and vigor as candidates for the Presidency.

Unlike the opposition, which is restricted to one rather tarnished heir apparent and one glittering but politically untried challenger, we can offer veterans of the political wars from every section of the Nation. Our party has, in short, what the Nation needs and the opposition lacks—leadership.

Let us raise our eyes to America's horizons of tomorrow. Let us look ahead not only 1 year or 10 years, but 50 years and 100 years. Let us build an America and a world in which free men live and prosper. Let us seize the opportunities for leadership which are ours.

These are the tenets and the vision of Jefferson and Jackson; the tenets and vision of the Democratic Party today.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 1959

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m.

Rev. Frederick T. Moffatt, D.D., pastor, First Baptist Church, Frankfort, Ky., offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, our shelter from the stormy blast, and our eternal home:

In Thee we live and move and have our being.

We thank Thee, O God, for this the loan of another day. May we use it wisely and well.

We pray the blessings of God upon the President and the Presiding Officer and the Members of the Senate. Bless the homes from whence they come.

Help all of us to remember that it is righteousness that exalteth a nation.

May Thy will be done, and may Thy kingdom come. In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1959.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. GALE W. MCGEE, a Senator

from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MCGEE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 22, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that, on April 22, 1959, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1096) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which

were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate:

The Finance Committee;

The Insurance Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service;

The Governmental Organization for Space Activities Subcommittee of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The Foreign Relations Committee; and

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.